

29th Floor

### United States Patent and Trademark Office



CONFIRMATION NO. ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. FIRST NAMED INVENTOR APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE 7091<del>-1</del>03x10102873 09/893,209 09/19/2001 Song Kim

7590

865 S. Figueroa Street Los Angeles, CA 90017

FULBRIGHT & JAWORSKI L.L.P.

12/11/2002

5641

EXAMINER

NGUYEN, TRINH T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

3726

DATE MAILED: 12/11/2002

RECEIVED

DEC 1 8 2002

בווו אם וויים וויים ביותות

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

:	· •					W.	
•		Application No. Applicant(s)					
Office Action Summary			09/893,209		Kim		
			Examiner Trinh Nguye	Examiner Art Unit Trinh Nguyen 3726			
	- The MAILING DATE of	f this communication an	pears on the cover sheet wi	ith the correspo	ndanoe addre		
Period	for Reply	——————————————————————————————————————	,	•			
			S SET TO EXPIRE3	MONTH(S	FROM		
	MAILING DATE OF THIS		(a). In no event, however, may a rep	ply be timely filled aft	er SIX (6) MONTH	S from the	
mailing	g date of this communication. period for reply specified above is les	ss than thirty (30) days, a reply t	within the statutory minimum of thirty	(SD) days will be co	nsidered timely.		
- If NO	period for reply is specified above, the	he meximum statutory period will	apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTH cause the application to become ABA	(\$ from the mailing o	late of this commu	nication.	
- Any re		three months after the mailing o	date of this communication, even if tin				
Status			•				
1) 💢	Responsive to communi	ication(s) filed on Nov	8, 2002			•	
2a) □	This action is FINAL.	2b) <b>⊠ T</b> h	is action is non-final.		•	•	
3) 🗆	Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under Ex parte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.						
Disposi	tion of Claims					· · · ·	
4) 🔯	Claim(s) <u>1 and 3-8</u>			is/are p	ending in the	application.	
4	4a) Of the above, claim(s	) <u>4-8</u>		is/are	withdrawn fr	om consideration.	
5) 🗆	Claim(s) is/are allowed.						
6) 💢	Claim(s) 1 and 3	and 3 is/are rejected.					
7) 🗆	Claim(s)		is/are objected to.				
8) 🗆	Claims	s are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.					
Applica	ition Papers						
9) 🗆	The specification is obje						
10)□	The drawing(s) filed on		is/are a) 🗆 accepted or	b) Objected	to by the Exa	aminer.	
_	· ·	•	the drawing(s) be held in a				
11)	The proposed drawing of	correction filed on	is: a) 🗆	spproved b	disapprov	ed by the Examiner	
_	• • •		reply to this Office action.				
	The oath or declaration		Examiner,	•		•	
'	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119		ign priority under 35 U.S.	C 8 110/a\-/a	1) 04 (f)		
_	Acknowledgement is in		ight phonity ander 35 C.S.		)) Or (1).		
	1. Certified copies of		s have been received				
	_	•	s have been received in A	Application No.			
	_		rity documents have been				
	application	from the International	Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a of the certified copies no	1)).			
_			nestic priority under 35 U.				
_	_		isional application has bee		•	·	
15)			nestic priority under 35 U.		and/or 121.		
Attachm	ent(s)						
_	rtice of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary (		•		
	Notice of Draftsperson's Petent Drawing Review (PTQ-948)  6) Notice of ≱nformal Patent Application (PTQ-152)  ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTQ-1449) Paper No(s),						
31 [ IN	ormation Disclosure Statement(s) (P	10-1449) Paper No(s)	_ 6)  Other:				

Page 2

Art Unit:

#### **DETAILED ACTION**

# Continued Examination under 37 CFR 1.114 After Final Rejection

1. A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 11/8/02 has been entered.

## Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 2. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
  - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 3. Claims 1-3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Serwer (US 3,030,696) in view of Tramont (US 5,693,141).

As shown in clearly in Figures 1, 2, and 4, and lines 1-55 of col. 2, Serwer clearly discloses all the limitations as claimed except for: 1) a natural sponge member formed on the roller tube having natural sponge protrusions capable of applying paint to a surface in a positive

Page 3

Art Unit:

design form; and 2) the base material comprises cotton. Note that Serwer's roller tube has at least one end being open since an end cap (23) is being inserted on this open end (see Figure 4).

Regarding 1) a natural sponge member formed on the roller tube...capable of applying paint to a surface in a positive design form, Tramont teaches the use of a natural sponge member formed on the roller tube wherein the natural sponge member having sponge protrusions capable of applying paint to a surface in a positive design form (see lines 60-63 of col. 8, lines 1-10 of col. 9, and Figure 4). It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to have replaced Serwer's synthetic sponge-like lamina 12 with a natural sponge member, as taught in Tramont, in order to save the cost of manufacturing a synthetic sponge member, and since Tramont states that the material can be either synthetic sponge or natural sponge (see lines 60-65 of col. 8).

Regarding 2), Serwer teaches the use of a backing/base layer as claimed, but made of "substantially non-elastic material, such as paper of others suitable flexible non-elastic sheeting" (see lines 1-8 of col. 2). Cotton is in this category. Furthermore, Applicant acknowledges that other materials can be used as the backing/base material (i.e., fabric, plastic sheets, natural or synthetic rubber) (see paragraph [0020] of page 4 of the specification). Hence, it would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the backing/base material is a matter of design choice, wherein no significant problem is solved, or unexpected result obtained by constructing the backing/base material out of either cotton, or fabric, or plastic sheets, or rubber as claimed versus the backing/base material utilized by Serwer,

Page 4

Art Unit:

since it has been held to be within the general skill of a worker in the art to select a known material on the basis of its suitability for the intended use as a matter of obvious design choice.

### Response to Arguments

- 4. Applicant's arguments filed 11/8/02 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
- 5. Applicant argues that Serwer does not teach a natural sponge member of predetermined thickness, the Examiner agrees. However, as described above in paragraph #3, the reference Tramont was cited to show that using "a natural sponge" member in a paint roller is old and well known. Furthermore, note that Tramont's roll medium (which is equivalent to Applicant's "member" as claimed in claim 1) is provided from either a separate blank material (which means that the blank material is being cut to a predetermined thickness and/or shape) or a continuous blank material (which means that the blank material is from a roll of sheet material that is not being cut).
- 6. Applicant further argues that there is nothing to suggest the use of a strip of natural sponge member onto the roller tube of Serwer, the Examiner disagrees. In this case, the Serwer reference teaches the use of a strip of "sponge-type" material onto a paint roller and the Tramont reference teaches the use of a strip of "natural sponge" material onto a paint roller. Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to replace Serwer's "sponge-type" material with Tramont's "natural sponge" material, since it would be a matter of design choice of material selection.

Page 5

Art Unit:

7. Applicant further argues that Tramont does not teach the strip being wound diagonally on the roller tube, the Examiner disagrees. In lines 22-27 of col. 5, Tramont teaches that the preformed shape (which is equivalent to the strip as claimed) is wrapped spirally around elongated core stock (which is equivalent to the roller tube as claimed).

#### Conclusion

8. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Trinh Nguyen whose telephone number is (703) 306-9082.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1148.

ttn

December 10, 2002